Dup

FELLOWSHIP

November 1944 — Vol. X—No. 11

Crisis in Philadelphia

By GLENN D. EVERETT

•

The Gandhi of Puerto Rico

By JAY HOLMES SMITH

•

Fellowship in Discovering Truth

By A. J. MUSTE

•

Thoughts on the Treatment of Germany

By GEORGE L. PAINE

"The peace will be no better than the men who make it. Governments create peace in their own image. . . . The first job of the peace planners is to plan a world without empires. Otherwise it will be a world without peace."

—Louis Fisher, in *Empire*
Duell, Sloan & Pearce

15 cents a copy

$1.50 a year

FROM MY STANDPOINT

John Haynes Holmes

THE presidential campaign, now coming to its close as this article reaches its readers, can have meant little to any pacifist. Differences between the two leading candidates are all on superficial points. On matters fundamental to the welfare not only of this nation but of all humanity, they have either joined in a common silence or else found themselves in perfect accord.

Thus, both Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Dewey are for pushing this war through to a complete and final victory. They propose to get an "unconditional surrender" from the enemy, east and west, though they destroy the whole world in the process. Neither one has a glimmer of Wilson's wisdom in seeing what victory does to peace.

Both men see the post-war world in terms of a new balance of power—an armed alliance of Britain, Russia, and the United States as over against the defeated enemy nations and the rest of the world generally. Of course, they use a lot of talk about "international cooperation," and the armies and navies they always describe as a police force to be used for the punishment of aggression and the preservation of peace. But the world thus organized and protected is to be the world of our dictation, which the rest of the human race must accept whether they like it or not.

Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Dewey are one in their basic philosophy of force. Whichever candidate is elected will carry right on in the old tradition of "might makes right." This is the tradition of empire which reaches in an unbroken line from ancient Egypt and Babylonia to modern Britain and Japan.

Both candidates are churchmen—the one is as happily photographed in a church doorway as the other! But neither one seems to have heard even a whisper of Jesus' gospel—"seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness"!

So I imagine that few pacifists have been much excited over this election, or much concerned as to its outcome. What difference does it make, as regards the future of mankind or the significance of our movement, which of these two candidates is elected? Our business is not with these frothy currents of passing events, but with the great deeps of human experience and thought. We are concerned with basic principles and ideals, not with the trivial policies of politicians.

What this means on our part is a steadfast opposition to the existing system and its whole partisan operation. The kind of opposition that the early Christians offered to the imperial system of Rome! We do not read that these Christians were much concerned with the coming and going of emperors. They took no part in the struggles over the imperial purple. These struggles must at times have seemed to involve the whole destiny of Rome and of the world, for Rome was the world. But they saw the Kingdom, which alone stood firm. For the Christians knew that the Empire was headed straight for a destruction which they could not prevent, and the course of which they could not delay or divert. It was not for them to bother with these worldly things. Their task was with the life of the spirit—to organize this life, to strengthen it, to perfect it, that, in its own right and by its own power, it might become a saving influence for men. St. Augustine summed it all up in his great concept of the City of God, and of the primary allegiance of all faithful followers of Christ to this ideal.

All this would seem to fit our own times as well as ancient times. Of course, existence is very different today. Its demands are so insistent, its complexities so tight about us, that we cannot escape the toils of society, even if we would. Furthermore, our minds are so fashioned by the democratic process that we feel rightly committed to the common life. Not to vote, for example, even in a futile election like this through which we are just now passing, would be to most of us a failure in civic duty. To many of us it has been a comfort to work for a presidential candidate like Norman Thomas! Yet it should still remain possible for us to create within and among ourselves a world which shall be our own, and which we can serve with our whole devotion. A City of God for our place and our time!

More and more am I inclining to feel, in the darkness of these days, that we pacifists must be resigned to, and also reassured in, a greater content with our own movements, our own groups, as the early Christians were content with their own little churches, scattered like seed-pods through the vast range of the Roman Empire. Like these Christians, we are weak, even futile, in any ability to determine the instant course of human events. So we fret, and fume, and protest, and revolt, if things do not go precisely our way. But why should we expect them, here and now, to go our way? Why not take our disappointments, frustrations, even persecutions, as inevitable, make the best of them with imperturbable sweetness of temper and firmness of faith, and go ahead and show what can be done with all things still against us? We are few in numbers. So were the early Christians! But our light may carry far; its influence may at last change the course of destiny.

It is the long view that we must take, the ultimate goal that we must seek. Deep down within our hearts must abide the conviction that it is the spirit that counts—"the things unseen" which are "eternal." Around us and through us sweep the tides of this great spirit, which are love, joy, patience, perseverance, and utter sacrifice. The good and true of every age gone by have contributed to this spiritual stream, and made it broad and deep. We also in our turn may make our contribution, and therewith flood the future with our faith.

Our task is to set a standard, make a record, bear a witness, and live a life that may transform all about us. For the spirit is not static, but dynamic. It is contagious like sunshine, health-giving like fresh air. The Kingdom is here, even now, within us. We may not live to see it established without. Nay, we of this generation must know that our eyes will never thus be blessed. But when it comes it will be the work of our hands, as already it is the light of our hearts.

FELLOWSHIP

Published by the
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
2929 Broadway
New York 25, N. Y.

JOHN NEVIN SAYRE, A. J. MUSTE } *Editors*

J. ELLIOTT FINLAY
Managing Editor

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Devere Allen
Walter Russell Bowie
Vera Brittain
Bernard C. Clausen
Sarah N. Cleghorn
Florence Converse
Henry H. Crane
Albert Edward Day
Eugene Exman
Caleb Foote
Albert Fowler
Richard B. Gregg
Helene Hale
John Haynes Holmes
Allan A. Hunter
Josephine W. Johnson
Muriel Lester
Halford E. Luccock
Elmore M. McKee
Ferner Nuhn
Kirby Page
Edith Loveioy Pierce
Edwin McNeill Poteat
Douglas V. Steere
John M. Swomley, Jr.
Howard Thurman

FELLOWSHIP is published monthly. Reentered as second class matter February 15, 1941, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., and at the Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

15 Cents a Copy $1.50 a Year

Fall Conferences

Since the last issue of FELLOWSHIP went to press, annual fall conferences of the FOR have been held at Chicago, Nashville, Denver, Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. Though reports have come in from most of these conferences, lack of space in this issue makes it necessary to postpone their publication until next month.

FELLOWSHIP

THE JOURNAL OF THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

November 1944 — Vol. X—No. 11

What will you do if your city faces race problems such as those that arose during the

Crisis in Philadelphia

By GLENN D. EVERETT*

ON Tuesday morning, August 1, the city of Philadelphia awoke to find itself facing one of the most serious crises that, in this period of growing racial tension, has yet confronted a major American city. Employees of the Philadelphia Transportation Company had gone on strike because eight Negro motormen, hired in compliance with an anti-discrimination order of the President's Fair Employment Practices Committee, were to start practice runs that day.[1] Streetcars coming in from the "owl" shifts in the early morning ran into the barns and did not return to the street. To an inquiring reporter the workers declared blandly that they were too "sick" at the thought of working with Negroes to be able to report for duty. By noon not a streetcar, bus, elevated train, or subway was operating.

The initial crisis was far more serious than the incidents that touched off the rioting that led 50 Americans to their deaths in Detroit and Beaumont last year. The life of this city of more than 2,000,000 people was completely disrupted. Nearly a million workers found themselves stranded at car and bus stops, many of them unable to find a way to get to work. Vital industry was paralyzed; offices were half-staffed; stores were without customers; meetings were cancelled; and thousands of citizens were acutely inconvenienced. "Idle hands are the devil's workshop" and as thousands of workingmen, unable to get to their jobs, crowded bars and taverns to while away the time and discuss the merits of Negro employment, the situation began to look menacing. Wild rumors swept the city. The Negro population, more than a quarter million persons, was on edge, realizing that all this vast turmoil and disruption, this crippling of production, was the result of eight Negroes being given jobs for which they appeared qualified and to which both the government and the company had said they were entitled. An ugly crisis was shaping. What did Philadelphia's civic and religious organizations do to ward off race violence?

They acted quickly and with precision. They were not able to head off all violence; about twenty people required hospital treatment—and for a time it seemed that the situation was going to get out of hand—but out of their experience in a period so fraught with danger have come ideas and suggestions that can be helpful to individuals who in their own communities may face a similar problem of coping with threatened violence.

First and foremost in the prevention of bloodshed was the fact that Philadelphia's civic and religious groups could draw upon a reservoir of interracial cooperation and understanding which had been created in their community prior to the appearance of this racial crisis. Such a reservoir did not exist by accident; it resulted from the hard work of many interested groups over a period of years. Space does not permit the mention of even half the groups that were active, but a few can be cited as typical:

There was Fellowship House, with its interracial program which included sponsorship of monthly interracial church services, so important in bringing Christians of two colors together. For several years it had sent representatives out to speak on race relations to any club or group that would listen. Thus it had built up many fruitful contacts.

There was the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission, a sort of clearing house for seven major race relations groups, which had attacked the problem of race relations with a program of education that included widespread distribution of pamphlets stressing the contributions of the colored races to American life and especially to the war effort.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People had been active for years in the betterment of racial relations. The North Philadelphia Civic League and the Negro Baptist Ministers Council were Negro groups that had done what they could on their side in promoting racial understanding.

The Philadelphia Federation of Churches has been moved to establish a Race Relations Department. This department called an urgent meeting of ministers on July 31 when they first heard rumors of a prospective strike. They called before them James Fitzsimon, International Vice President of the Transport Workers Union (CIO), serving as head of the newly-chosen local

* Glenn Everett, young Washington newspaperman and FOR member, has made an intensive study of the Philadelphia strike. He is co-author with Herbert C. Bergstrom of a pamphlet "The FEPC Faces a Crisis: The Philadelphia Strike" which has been published by the Friends. Those who wish a more complete story of the strike, particularly as to background events such as the interunion dispute and the role played by the Army, may obtain a copy of this pamphlet from the American Friends Service Committee, 20 S. 12th St., Philadelphia, Pa., for 5 cents.

[1] There were other contributing causes for the strike, but this article, for the purpose of brevity, will deal only with the principal one, race prejudice.

in lieu of yet-to-be-elected officers. He assured them that the CIO would support the Negroes' right to work.

A group which had been attacking the specific problem that brought on the strike was the Metropolitan Council for Equal Job Opportunity, composed of leading citizens and delegates from more than a score of organizations. They had reached the personnel director of every large Philadelphia plant and had talked over the problems of Negro employment with those who dealt most intimately with them. They had helped many Negroes get jobs, and colored citizens listened with respect to this group when they urged caution during the strike, assuring them that all would turn out well.

Finally, an organization known as the Interracial Committee had been formed in September, 1943, by a group of civic-minded citizens. It was headed by Dr. Jacob Billikoff, professional labor relations arbiter, and under the leadership of such subcommittee chairmen as Dr. Merriweather, head of the city's Crime Prevention Bureau, and Dr. Frederick Gruenberg, local administrator of OPA rent control, had made progress in attacking the problems of Negro juvenile delinquency and inadequate housing. This committee was formed with the purpose of getting Mayor Bernard Samuel to appoint a municipal race relations committee. But the latter, after appointment, was so inactive that the Interracial Committee decided to continue in existence.

Attacking the Problem

Thus was Philadelphia prepared with a background of interracial cooperation to meet the crisis thrust upon it. The first step of the city's civic leaders was, naturally enough, to try to persuade the PTC operators to go back to work. They rapidly reached Mr. Fitzsimon, and in company with various city leaders he went to the car barns and pleaded with the men to return to their jobs. CIO officials in New York sent a sharp message. But Fitzsimon was greeted with boos and cat-calls. White supremacy was the rule of the day, and all attempts to reason with the men failed.

With the workers apparently intending to stay out, it became imperative to prevent violence. The NAACP and the Council for Equal Job Opportunity somehow managed to get 100,000 handbills printed and distributed in the Negro sections the very first night of the strike. "Attention citizens!" the handbills shouted, "Keep your heads and tempers! Treat other people as you would be treated." It pointed out that both governmental agencies and the union were standing pat on the subject of hiring Negroes and that the strikers would gain nothing. The North Philadelphia Civic League came out next morning with large posters in Negro neighborhoods urging, "Negroes, think before you act! Your neighbors are not your enemies. Let's all cooperate for mutual helpfulness." They sent members out to talk to every group they found gathered on street corners and to urge restraint.

This was not enough, however, to head off the violence that broke out Tuesday night. Gangs of young Negroes, homeward bound from a carnival, smashed store windows and looted property. Cars driven by white motorists were stopped and their occupants beaten. Some Negro motorists were stopped by whites and similarly beaten. But there were no armed bands of whites clashing with armed bands of Negroes, as there were in Detroit.

The police showed restraint but were quick and firm in making arrests. They prevailed upon Mayor Samuel to close every bar, tavern, and drinking place in the city. Those were the festering places where violence threatened to get under way. Officials in suburban communities cooperated splendidly by closing drinking spots in their jurisdictions or by enforcing very early curfews. This ban stayed on for eight days, too, although liquor dealers lost a million dollars worth of business.

The strikers had boasted that "every white man in Philadelphia" would back them in their stand against the Negroes. The organizations previously mentioned set about to show them that that was not true. Prominent citizens wrote letters to the newspapers or issued public statements. Scores of declarations of Negro rights literally snowed under the letters from such white supremists as the one who wrote, "I only know the average, insulting Negro, not the occasional Negro Eleanor Roosevelt comes into contact with and writes so lovingly about." The newspapers were encouraged to take a strong editorial stand against the strike. *The Record* gave the strikers such a tongue-lashing in an editorial, "A Shame On Our City," that they were moved to write an open letter to the paper crying, "Don't wave the flag or quote the Bible or the Constitution. You will be sobbing about home and mother next, and maybe we aren't treating little Nellie just right."

That this public argument had effect is evidenced by the *Evening Bulletin's* impartial poll published August 14 which showed that 52.3 per cent of all Philadelphians favored the employment of Negroes as car operators, against 37.4 per cent opposed and 10.3 per cent undecided, with only 25.5 per cent answering affirmatively the question of whether the strike was justified.

On Wednesday evening, the second night of the strike, the North Philadelphia Civic League invited scores of white storekeepers who had been victimized by looting to a meeting in McDowell Presbyterian Church and there many Negro men offered to serve as volunteer policemen to curb the vandalism. Negro Baptist ministers met the same evening and asked white ministers to join them. Many churches in the city, both Protestant and Jewish, had meetings to organize their leading men to help control threatening situations; ministers mobilized every resource. The Negro Elks requested every member of their lodge to be on duty to keep their neighborhoods on an even keel, while Negro veterans did the same.

Significant in the prevention of violence was the fact that the Negro people in Philadelphia were not afraid of violence against them by the whites. There was none of the feeling of "get them before they get you" that inspired so much of the Detroit bloodshed.

By Thursday night the situation was pretty well under control. But the strike was still going strong. Federal, city, and union officials, increasingly worried by the tie-up in the nation's second most vital war production center, appealed to the President to sign a War Labor Board order to seize the traction lines. On Friday morning the order was signed on a warship in the Pacific and Major-General Philip Hayes, of the Third Service Command, arrived on the Philadelphia front with 5,000 troops. It should be emphasized that the soldiers came in to enforce the

WLB back-to-work order, not primarily to cope with violence or disorders.

Gen. Hayes ordered the men back to their jobs at once. The strikers laughed. He pleaded. They dared him. Strike leader James McMenamin reportedly said, "They can't stand over each one of us with a gun and make us run a car." Gen. Hayes tacitly conceded as much. But the strikers had forgotten about the government's arsenal of coercive measures. In brief, Gen. Hayes ordered the men to report by a midnight deadline, and threatened that those failing, if of draft age, would have deferments immediately withdrawn, and if over draft age, would be dismissed from their jobs, with the War Manpower Commission indicating that no job referrals would be given to any worker thus discharged. The Justice Department promised prosecution of possible Smith-Connaly Act violators and the FBI began asking questions. As the midnight deadline neared, Army drivers began showing up in GI busses, ready and able to take over transportation on any routes which failed to function. The strikers decided that further defiance would avail nothing and rushed for the timeclocks. The strike was broken.

For a week armed guards rode the streetcars, but there were few incidents. The first streetcars were greeted with applause in the Negro sections. It was not until August 18, however, that the Army felt able to terminate its control and allow the streetcar-weary soldiers to depart from the City of Brotherly Love.

Eight strikers were dismissed from their jobs by the Army. Thirty men have been indicted by the Federal grand jury which has investigated the strike, being charged with violation of the National Wartime Labor Disputes Act. They will be brought to trial in the near future.

Problem Not Solved

The Negroes have remained hired. Under Army guard they made their practice runs, and now they have gone on regular duty, thus far without incident. The issue at stake, however, is far from resolved. The strikers, defeated in their open defiance, have shown that they are adept at passive resistance.

Operators have said that, though they may have to work beside Negroes, they will not speak to them under any circumstances and will make relations as unpleasant as possible. When a Negro operator is on a line, one PTC employee has confided, the car ahead of him goes as fast as possible, the one to the rear very slowly, so that he is caught in the middle with a heavy load of passengers. This will not only make the Negro's work harder, but as he falls behind, will make passengers think him incompetent.

A dozen Negroes in the midst of 6,000 hostile employees may feel mighty lonesome. It is quite possible that they can ultimately be forced to resign. They have before them the hopeful picture of nearly a score of cities where Negroes are employed on carlines, but there may be hard days ahead.

The Philadelphia strike has indicated the weakness of force as a weapon in racial progress. The weakness of FEPC directives as law is the same as the basic weakness of prohibition statutes; there is not enough public opinion behind their enforcement. Senator Richard Russell (Ga.) said, "I hate to think, gentlemen, what would have happened had the Philadelphia incident occurred in one of our large Southern cities."

When the PTC strikers declared, "Every white man will stand back of us!" they revealed their Achilles heel. Their pained cry at the *Record's* editorial reveals the potency of such criticism. Men cannot long stick to the guns of prejudice if they are made uncertain of their ground, if every respectable citizen shows contempt for their bigotry. Men striving to justify themselves in an unjustifiable situation can be made to retreat with reddened faces much faster by fellow citizens who let them know that they are ashamed of them than they can by all the armed soldiers and prisons in the country.

The Philadelphia branch of the FOR is continuing to attack the problem of racial ill-will. During the strike the FOR sent letters to newspaper editors which were published, telegrams to the mayor and officials of the PTC and the WMC, and assisted in getting the message of caution and restraint across through distribution of handbills, and through announcements in Negro theaters and over the radio program. Many FOR members, as individuals, are active in Fellowship House and in other interracial groups. It is the belief of James E. Bristol, Philadelphia secretary, that in the Philadelphia situation pacifists can best participate in interracial work at present as members of other groups, adding their leaven rather than trying to organize parallel activities of their own. Thus the FOR participated with 36 other groups in the sponsorship of an interracial conference on "Equality of Opportunity" held at the downtown YMCA on October 7, and is lending its support to other constructive efforts.

Philadelphia has come out of its experience awakened to the danger that lies like loosely-packed dynamite in America's current racial situation. Civic leaders are letting no grass grow under their feet as they attack the problem of prejudice. The Federation of Churches is investigating anti-Negro and anti-Semitic outbreaks which have been reported in eleven Philadelphia schools. A civic organization known as the City Policy Committee is seeking to unify the activities of all groups working on racial fellowship, so that their work will fit into a well-integrated pattern and neither compete nor overlap.

The strike showed the woeful need for cooperation among all civic groups and the value of a central clearing house. Above all, Philadelphia's leaders urgently recommend that other cities which confront similar racial tensions lose no time in building interracial fellowship that will make crises impossible, paying particular attention to labor unions because of the danger that strife will center around job opportunities in the post-war period. And they strongly insist that every city ought to have a blueprint of plans ready to meet an emergency. Know what you are going to do in your city, they say, to head off violence before the threat of violence has appeared. Be ready, as are military strategists, to meet any contingency. A situation can get out of hand in a matter of hours. Do not count upon improvisation. Work constructively as hard as you can with every group available to prevent racial violence, but be ready for the ugly crisis if it comes. Those are the words of admonition from Philadelphia leaders that pacifists may do well to consider as they seek to make a contribution to the problem.

The Gandhi of Puerto Rico

By JAY HOLMES SMITH

MY many visits with Don Pedro Albizu Campos in a New York hospital during the past year have been one of the great experiences of my life. Here is a man who combines in a powerful and winsome personality such qualities of leadership that he is known throughout Latin America as the Gandhi of Puerto Rico. Soon after discovering this great rebel, I urged Bayard Rustin, who had been in Puerto Rico with the Friends, to visit him. He exclaimed, "Oh, that's the man they count next to God in Puerto Rico!"

While a student at Harvard young Pedro, first president of the Cosmopolitan Club, which is Harvard's International House, led a pilgrimage of foreign students, including an Indian prince and a West African prince, to Concord, shrine of American freedom. But last year, on June 3, this great man was released, broken in health, from Atlanta prison after serving six years of a sentence for trying to lead his country to freedom from Yankee imperialism!

His father was a descendant of the grandees of Spain, his mother a blend of French, Spanish, and Negro. The father had a pathetic confidence that the intervention of the United States in the government of Puerto Rico would be a boon to the island, and he had the satisfaction of being the only Puerto Rican on hand when the flag of the U. S. A. was first raised on the island by American troops in 1898. Naturally, young Pedro was sent to the United States for his higher education. At Vermont University he was a freshman prodigy, and lectured to the whole university on the science of government. Transferring to Harvard, he had a distinguished career for eight years, taking first a degree in science and then about all the legal training Harvard could offer.

Like Gandhi, in the first World War Campos became "a self-appointed recruiting sergeant," taking at face value the slogan of the day about making the world "safe for democracy." He went further. He became an instructor in military science, even in the art of the bayonet. But, like Gandhi, he reacted and now speaks with feeling about the brutality of all war. "There is no conquest without brutality," he declares. Military training itself is a course in brutality. "The expectation of being forced to take another's life sears the Christian conscience."

Returning to his native island after the war, Don Pedro had many attractive offers, some from the government, but refused them all and went into private legal practice in order to be free to lead his people to independence. He soon gathered about him some of Puerto Rico's most ardent and able spirits and developed an influential nationalist movement. Year after year, even while in prison, he has been elected president of the Nationalist Party of Puerto Rico. Its standpoint is practically the same as that of the Indian National Congress. It demands the orderly withdrawal of the Yankee imperialist government from the island, with provision for a constitutional convention to set up the new national government.

The Nationalist Party has used what its leader describes as the method of "peaceful direct action." It has consistently boycotted the polls in the insular elections. How effective this protest has been may be indicated by the official report that there was a thirty-five per cent falling off of the vote in 1940. Campos said to his people, "If we refuse to furnish the hands to club down our people, the empire cannot survive."

This Puerto Rican patriot has tried to train his people in strict democracy. A devout Catholic, he made a practice of opening each annual convention of the party by offering the invocation. Then he would present his own resignation and that of his cabinet. Convention officers were elected, and one by one the old cabinet were put on the carpet for a vigorous examination of their stewardship. At the end of the convention there was a fresh election of officers for the ensuing year.

Although he has not taken an outright pacifist position, feeling that his people do not have the background to understand it, he has consistently held them to strict nonviolence in practice. I asked him what qualities he covets most in himself and the members of his movement. He answered without hesitation, "Humility and patience." This from a Latin revolutionist!

An Unfulfilled Promise

When General Nelson Miles hoisted the stars and stripes over Puerto Rico forty-six years ago, he said: "The people of the United States, in the cause of liberty, justice, and humanity . . . come bearing the banner of freedom, inspired by a noble purpose . . . not to make war upon the people of a country that for centuries has been oppressed, but on the contrary to bring you protection . . . to promote your prosperity, and to bestow upon you the immunities and blessings of the liberal institutions of our government."

Yet, with amazing candor, Rexford B. Tugwell, now Governor of Puerto Rico, confessed in his official report of a year ago that the people of the island are no better off than when we took them over in '98! He went on to charge that we have no settled policy for the island but are simply drifting. John Gunther, who has seen much of the world's misery in East and West, declared upon visiting Puerto Rico that the poverty and disease he saw there rivaled the worst of China or India.

In 1934 Campos became a marked man in the eyes of "the interests" when he led a successful general strike against the huge sugar companies of the island, dominated by American capital. They had been paying forty cents a day, while often returning twelve per cent to their investors.

Unemployment has run as high as sixty per cent within recent years. Child mortality is four times that of the United States. While India starves under the British flag, Puerto Rico does little better under ours.

It was under the governorship of Major-General Winship, of Georgia, that a reign of terror began in Puerto Rico in 1935. The Ku Klux Klan dared to raise its head. Albizu Campos publicly denounced it, saying that they would not for a moment tolerate any such nonsense in

that part of the world. It was driven underground, but the Nationalist "secret service" had already discovered that several of the civil and military officials were members of it. They evidently vowed to "get" Don Pedro.

Contrary to their Nationalist training, two youths assassinated the American head of the island's constabulary, who, ironically enough, was actually a friend of Albizu Campos. The youths were taken to police headquarters and summarily shot to death. Soon afterward Campos and seven of his comrades were charged with "conspiring to overthrow the United States government by force." The first jury disagreed, though all of the Americans on it voted for conviction. The second one, ten Americans and two Puerto Ricans in American employ, found them "guilty." Everybody in the island sensed that their leaders were being railroaded, but the proof did not come out until more than a year later. Meanwhile, Latin America was rankling with the injustice of it all. The Puerto Rican clergy took a step unprecedented since the Middle Ages. They appealed over the heads of their American bishops to the Pan-American conference in Buenos Aires, in 1936, for the release of Puerto Rico's political prisoners and the recognition of her independence.

At this historic conference President Roosevelt rose to speak on Pan-American unity. At that moment, as agreed upon by influential Latin American friends of Puerto Rican freedom, the son of the President of Argentina (no youngster) rose in the front row and shouted, "Down with American Imperialism! Long live Puerto Rico! Long live Albizu Campos!" The Latin press carried a cartoon with a monstrous figure of Roosevelt waxing eloquent over Pan-American democracy with his foot on the bleeding body of Puerto Rico.

An Imprisoned Patriot

For a year the Nationalist patriot was kept in a San Juan prison, for the authorities wanted to make use of his willingness to issue appeals to his people to refrain from violence, in spite of grievous provocation. "Serenidad" was the watchword he kept sending his followers.

The worst of many blots on our record in Puerto Rico is the Palm Sunday Massacre of 1937. Its obvious purpose was to terrorize the rising Nationalist movement into submission. A procession of Nationalists, many of them young men and women, had gathered in finely disciplined ranks in Ponce for a parade. Since it was Palm Sunday they were going to combine worship with homage to their great leader in prison by marching to his home church, singing on their way. They had taken the precaution of getting a permit, although none was legally required. As they were about to march, squads of constabulary, heavily armed, drew up and partly surrounded the procession. They were ordered to disperse. Under those circumstances men and women of any mettle could not comply. They conferred, quietly started the procession, and were ruthlessly mowed down. Twenty-one were killed and some two hundred wounded.

The Governor was later shown to have grossly falsified his report to Washington, adding lurid details which were not in the report of the police officer in charge, such as the allegation that the Nationalists fired first and then continued firing from the roofs and street for several minutes.

The American Civil Liberties Union sent Arthur Garfield Hays to investigate. He formed a commission of inquiry composed of eminent Puerto Ricans, none of them Nationalists, which did a thorough job. They proved to the hilt that it was a cold-blooded massacre. To quote the Commission report: "Photographs taken at the time show not a single Nationalist with any weapon of any kind, and this was admitted before the Legislative Committee, by police officials. . . . No witness was able to give the Commission a single instance in the last five years of Puerto Rican history where there had been any disorder or violence . . . at any parade or public assembly."

As I study the revolutionary situation in Puerto Rico under General Winship's tyranny, I am amazed at the very small number of retaliations by the Nationalists under sore provocation. I can attribute this only to their leader's training of his followers in resisting non-violently. Gandhi's score on a percentage basis is not as good.

To add insult to injury, twelve of the Nationalists who escaped death in the massacre were tried for first degree murder! And, incredible as it seems, General Winship was kept in the Governor's mansion for three years longer.

Many accounts of the gross mistreatment of Sr. Albizu Campos in Atlanta have appeared in the Latin press from time to time. This is a gruesome chapter which deserves special inquiry. A physician in the hospital where he is now a patient says two years of careful treatment will be necessary before Campos can be sure he will not be an invalid for life. And we have stupidly done this to a man revered throughout Latin America.

When finally, his health badly shattered, Don Pedro was told that the time had come for his release on four years' probation, he replied firmly that he could not accept such a conditional release, for he felt that he must make his case a test of American sincerity as to its "Good Neighbor Policy." To have accepted it would have been to acknowledge the authority of the U. S. court in his native land and the validity of its action. He was released in spite of his attitude.

Two months ago a critical situation arose. The judge who sentenced him, a former governor of South Carolina, ordered that he must either turn in his probation reports within a month or be returned to San Juan for re-sentence. After trying desperately to get executive action (the President is the only man in America with authority over a Puerto Rican court), we were gratified to get the assurance that the execution of the order had been suspended, evidently pending the President's decision in the case.

The progressive measures of the Tugwell Administration can be no substitute for a genuine atonement for the old ruthless regime. We must bring forth fruits worthy of repentance! Our Government should declare a general amnesty for the few remaining Puerto Rican political prisoners. We should recognize their inalienable right to self-government and encourage the rising tide of demand for the independence of the island. We should offer Puerto Rico the most generous reparation for her economic ruination by predatory American interests, and give her preferential tariff treatment until she can achieve rehabilitation. If the issue of India's freedom is the acid test of Britain's sincerity as champion of world democracy, the freedom of Puerto Rico is the test of ours.

Should the NSBRO issue be allowed to break the fellowship of the FOR?

Fellowship in Discovering Truth

By A. J. MUSTE

A CONSIDERABLE number of members of the Fellowship believe that the National Service Board for Religious Objectors and the various bodies administering Civilian Public Service Camps and projects are actually cooperating with government officials in administering conscription. They believe that this is an intolerable, stultifying, and corrupting position for churches and pacifist bodies generally to be in, and that the Fellowship ought to withdraw from NSBRO.

I am not now going into the arguments for and against this step. But, as is generally known, I personally am in agreement on this issue with the members referred to in the opening paragraph. Some of them, including very dear friends and some of the most devoted religious pacifists I know, have in recent weeks resigned from the Fellowship, believing that the organization itself was spiritually compromised and fatally handicapped in its fight against permanent conscription by continuing to be associated with the government in administering conscription, and also that as individuals they were compromised and their witness confused if they did not withdraw from FOR. Some of them have felt that I too should withdraw. I have tried to give them privately my reasons for not doing so. Recently the National Council asked me to set them forth in *Fellowship*. There are first some considerations of an organizational character and then one of a profounder sort.

First of all, where so grave an issue is at stake one might have to consider withdrawal from an organization if it were moving farther and farther away from the position one regarded as right. But the exact opposite is the case here. As recently as three years ago only a handful of FOR members were fundamentally opposed to the NSBRO-CPS set-up. As recently as last December, though members of the Council differed in their personal preferences, they voted with virtual unanimity against withdrawal from NSBRO. By May of this year there was actually a 14 to 10 vote in favor of withdrawal among those present at the meeting, though a mail poll resulted in a small majority the other way. Since then, without a single exception, so far as I know, where members of the Fellowship, including Council members, have changed their position it has been to favor withdrawal from NSBRO. Under the circumstances, it seems obvious that those who favor withdrawal should not resign from FOR, but should continue free discussion of the issue with the hope of winning others to their point of view.

In that connection, one might have to consider withdrawing from an organization if discussion of an important issue were discouraged or an attempt made to "freeze" the status quo and to muzzle dissent. Again, the exact opposite is the case. Two instances may be noted. The majority of FOR staff members are in favor of withdrawal from NSBRO, and have been for a good while. They have not been picked with that in mind. Some have changed their views after joining the staff. They are all people who have gifts of expression and who have constantly expressed themselves on this particular issue, though they have always sought to distinguish between their personal opinions and the position of the organization. Not the slightest attempt to censor or muzzle them has ever been made. Moreover, at this moment all the Fellowship's members in CPS and prison are being circularized individually in an effort to determine what they believe our course in this matter should be.

A somewhat more complicated problem is stated thus by some of our members: "So long as the FOR *as an organization* is a part of NSBRO it involves those of us who regard the NSBRO-CPS pattern as fundamentally evil in supporting that against which our consciences revolt. Within the organization and without we are indeed free to make our protest, but the organization of which we are a part does the evil thing. Thus our consciences are coerced. If FOR were to withdraw from NSBRO, this would not involve any similar coercion of the consciences of those who want to support CPS because they would still be free to do that, as individuals or through FOR groups or other agencies which desire to render such support." Frankly, I feel that there is considerable force to this argument and I believe that the spirit of fellowship requires that it be given serious and prayerful consideration by those to whom it is addressed. It has to be recognized that there are a number of ardent and devoted spirits who sincerely feel that they are thus being thrust out of the Fellowship and that they have no alternative but resignation.

Certain observations may be made on the other side. It is not true, as some seem to think, that some of their contributions to the FOR general budget are used for support of NSBRO. Our contribution to the administrative upkeep of NSBRO and the expenses of our staff members in connection with CPS work are paid out of our special CO Fund, which also is used for CO dependents, educational work in CPS, and work for men in prison. Individual contributors may designate for which purpose they wish their gifts to this fund to be used.

More important is the fact that some of those who oppose withdrawal from NSBRO undoubtedly feel that support of CPS is a sacred obligation and that withdrawal of it would be a species of treason to our members in CPS and to the historic peace churches. Thus, conscience in their case is deeply involved in the Fellowship's continuing in NSBRO. Personally, I am left with the feeling that a more clear and direct coercion of the conscience is involved in asking those who believe the Fellowship should withdraw to remain in. But we shall neither understand the problem nor solve it unless we recognize that the deepest feelings and convictions are involved on both

sides. Under these circumstances, those who favor withdrawal must be given full opportunity to make it clear that as individuals they do not support the organization's present stand. And the same would be true for the others if that stand should be altered.

Suppose, in these circumstances, that I or others withdraw from FOR. Would that make our opposition to the present position any more clear than it is? In my own case at least, I do not see that it would. Would it necessarily reduce my involvement in what I regard as an evil compromise? Superficially perhaps yes. But no one can read himself out of the pacifist movement by resigning from an organization. My responsibility for that movement and its shortcomings would remain just what it had been—including my responsibility for getting FOR into NSBRO and CPS, because I hoped and believed they would be something other than they proved to be. Besides, on the morning after resignation my responsibilities for winning others to what I regard as a sounder position on this question would remain exactly what they had been. More important, my responsibilities for proclaiming my religious pacifist faith and making it effective in action would remain. Could I discharge these responsibilities more effectively on the outside? I am certain I could not. I would have to work with other people who share my religious pacifist faith. Where are they? In the Fellowship and not outside it. So I would necessarily still have to work with the Fellowship.

I do not mean to say that I regard the FOR as an organization as necessarily sacrosanct or possessed of the attribute of immortality. But I have had much experience with organizations and movements in my lifetime. As I wrote to a group of young men some weeks ago, I see no better means than FOR to work for "religiously-based revolutionary pacifism. . . . FOR as it is today is the result of the labors and prayers and tears of many men and women. Because of what has gone into it, upon FOR, nationally and internationally, a great responsibility rests today. To me it is as inconceivable that at this time and under these conditions I should leave my post in FOR as that I should obey any item in a conscription law. I believe that I am conscripted by God and by the demands of this hour for the work which I am doing."

This conviction rests finally upon a foundation which goes deeper than all organizational considerations. The Fellowship as its name suggests is not primarily an organization working for certain specific objectives. It is a *fellowship*. To the extent that it realizes its purpose and is true to its own spirit, it is an end in itself. For fellowship, community, is the end of human existence.

The Statement of Purpose contains a profound and suggestive description of a fellowship. It is composed of men and women who "wish to explore the possibilities of love for discovering truth, dispelling antagonisms, and reconciling people, despite all differences, in a friendly society."

More than anything else the world needs such a fellowship or fellowships. Where it exists, there is God; and peace and joy. Furthermore, the one real possibility of discovering moral and social truth is within such fellowships. Where men and women surrendered to God open their hearts, as they wait together, to the leading of his spirit, "the sense of the meeting" is a revelation of God's truth and with the revelation of the truth comes also power to proclaim and live it. Over and over again in the history of religion in its creative periods this has been demonstrated.

More important than the position which we hold at any given moment, which is in any case certain to be a partial one and mixed with error and sin, is that we are engaged in "exploring the possibilities of love for *discovering truth.*" Not that it is unimportant that we discover and apply the truth in this matter of conscription and the various issues related to it; but except by the way of fellowship and love and prayer we shall not discover it. We might discover something that looks like it. But even if I know all mysteries and all knowledge and have not love, it is nothing. Yes, I may even go to prison and give my body to be burned but if I have not love, it is nothing.

Here also the means will determine the end. If the spirit of God is upon us, if we cease not to explore the possibilities of love, we shall correct our mistakes. But if on either side we try to force things, become self-righteous, cease to pray, stop exploring the possibilities of love "for reconciling people, despite all differences," something far more terrible will have happened than a terrible mistake over a crucial issue.

I do not mean that differences should be blurred or regarded as unreal. On the contrary. Fellowship which can exist only among those who think alike is a cheap and spurious thing. When we become afraid of intense discussion, unity and fellowship are already broken. When people cannot "have things out," the cleavage between them becomes an abyss; all security is gone. "Love casteth out fear and sets us facing differences and exploring—pioneering.

Nor do I mean that an organizational break is never necessary or might not be an unavoidable step in a process of true reconciliation. I myself believe that we should break organizationally with NSBRO. But here it is primarily a matter of a relation between organizations and not between members in a fellowship which has continued through many years; and I think there is no possibility that under its present leadership NSBRO will break with Selective Service. I believe others would understand our action in withdrawing and would honor us for it. But, even so, its efficacy and virtue would depend entirely on the way and the spirit in which it was done, and whether ultimately it contributed to the deepening of understanding and fellowship among all concerned.

So long as in a body like the Fellowship an issue is open and there is honest, humble seeking for truth, a waiting upon God, as there is among us at the present moment, and I think increasingly, with regard to our relation to NSBRO and the whole issue of conscription, it would in my opinion be unwise and wrong to break away. It would be an act against fellowship and therefore could result only in frustration.

In a genuine sense FOR is today a fellowship, engaged in the perilous adventure of exploring the possibilities of love for discovering truth. What holds us together is our sense of inadequacy, our need of God, the honesty and humility and anguish of our search for truth, our prayer that love may work through us. Nothing else can hold us together, but neither is anything else needed. If we should lose these things, we are lost. As they grow in us, we shall remain and become a fellowship, and God Himself shall be with us and be our God.

Thoughts on the Treatment of Germany

By GEORGE L. PAINE

IT should not be necessary to smash Germany to pieces in order to make her know that she has been licked. She has seen that her two vast and unprecedented preparations for conquest have completely failed. Her youth has been almost wholly wiped out and the reported age of her soldiers now averages 30 years. Many of her biggest and finest cities are in ruins, including Berlin, Bremen, Cologne, Hamburg, and Leipsig. About two million of her civilians, men, women, and children, have perished in the obliteration bombing. She has seen and felt on every hand the hatred of the peoples whose lands she has overrun, until she must feel like Cain with the mark on his forehead. Even with most of Europe's population in her power to work for her and feed her, she cannot fool herself this time into believing that she has not been beaten and her supreme efforts thoroughly frustrated.

To be restrained in our treatment of the defeated Germans means not that there should be no retributive punishment for those chiefly responsible for the many Nazi crimes. But, that all Germans are not Nazis or brutes is evident from the following facts. A million or more Germans have had to be put out of the way in concentration camps. Millions have been tormented in other ways because they would not comply with Hitler's orders or properly persecute the Jews instead of secretly helping to keep them alive. The underground movement has been and still is running strongly. Nor would restrained treatment preclude some measure of policing or overseeing of the government of the new Germany and in order to guard against her rearming for purposes of aggression.

Perhaps the most potent means of preventing Germany from making another attempt at conquest would be to grant her ready access to the markets of the world both for buying and selling, and to aid her in attaining economic prosperity instead of holding her down to limited production at home and restricted commerce abroad.

A prosperous people is likely to be a contented people, and vice versa. Hitler rose to power chiefly because of Germany's chaotic economic conditions and her sense of having been unfairly treated and humiliated. The Germans were ready to fight to regain their self-respect and their rightful place in the sun. Make Germany feel that she is a respected member of the family of nations and that the international laws of the world organization to be set up will deal justly with her, as with all law-abiding nations, and she will see that her good behavior will be to her own interest.

Harsh treatment will be the surest way to provoke another war, at least if we do not go as far as those who advise the complete dismemberment of Germany and the use of power to see that the parts do not get together again; or those who would castrate the German men; or those who, like Westbrook Pegler, would "exterminate the German people." Naturally, dead people cannot fight another war!

The "never again movement," as propounded by Van Sittart of England, the chairman of the history department at the University of Chicago, and others, would naturally instill in the hearts of the remaining German people such hatred and bitterness that they would burn with a spirit of revenge and again plan for "Der Tag" when they could get back at their enemies and pay them back in kind. Rex Stout, chairman of the War Writers' Board, may think it good policy to teach our soldiers the duty to hate and to act in that spirit toward the Germans, but the prevailing sentiment of our people opposes such doctrine; and the British High Command insists that it is not good or necessary military policy but rather the reverse. General Smuts' forecast after World War I was verified. He said, "The Versailles Treaty breathes a poisonous spirit of revenge that may yet scorch the face of the earth." It was fortunate that Wellington's wise counsel prevailed at the Peace Conference in 1815, after the crushing defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo, when he insisted that "France must be allowed to live in self-respect and happiness." France and Great Britain had been bitter and mortal enemies for 15 years, but since that generous treaty of 1815 they have lived as friends.

To quote one of the dicta of the significant Delaware Conference: "Means must be sought effectively to counteract hatred and vengeance as controlling motives." To quote also from the late Archbishop of Canterbury, "We must look forward to the renewed friendship with the German people."

It is well also to recall that the blockade of Germany by the Allies in 1919-20 had to be called off because of the ever-increasing objections of the British soldiers stationed in Germany who, in spite of stringent military orders, insisted on sharing their rations with the starving people. What President Roosevelt wrote to Congress on August 25, 1943, should be applied also to the conquered Axis Powers: "We aim to make it possible for the liberated peoples to create a free political life of their own choosing, and to attain economic security."

Finally, those of us who are Christians will necessarily bear in mind that one of the basic principles of our faith is forgiveness. Unfortunately, it is taking the world a long time to grasp the full significance of the cardinal tenet, implicit in the fundamental thesis of Christianity, that God is love and that men must love one another even as they must love God.

Jesus simply would not put up with the Old Testament maxim of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." He said, "Turn the other cheek," and forgive not merely seven times, but "seventy times seven"—that is, indefinitely and always. Even on the cross he prayed, "Father, forgive them."

You break your enemy's heart when you generously forgive him and bring him over to your side. Jesus was wiser than men think. He exhorted, "Resist not evil," but "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you" (Matt. 5:39, 44). What blows and curses will never accomplish, kindness, forbearance, love, and forgiveness will. That way and that way alone lies the hope of preventing future strife between nations and ensuring to a war-weary world the blessing of abiding peace.

WHITE CORPUSCLES for the WORLD

By JOHN NEVIN SAYRE*

Chairman of the International Fellowship of Reconciliation

OUR international Fellowship has survived the war. Its spiritual solidarity is unbroken. It lives in the principal countries where it was planted. In certain lands its membership has increased. And I am confident that almost everywhere the heart of it has come through the fire like radium. But our ordeal is not over. We face a superhuman post-war task. This war, we have been told, was a judgment for the sins of the civilization out of which it came. That is true. But we have now to face an added judgment of further consequences for the sins that were done *in* the war. We cannot by-pass them.

First, the war's material and spiritual destructiveness has been global. So the size of the task devolving upon IFOR has been multiplied to world-wide dimensions. The Far East, the Near East, Russia, Poland, Europe, Africa, and, in a different way, South America, cry out for white corpuscles to heal the wounds of war. Can we supply them?

Second, not only in geographical extent, but also in its destructiveness on the civilian front this war has been unprecedented. To the actual damage to property must be added the further tragedy of the bitter divisions caused by conflicting ideologies within nations. The class wars, the fifth columns, the extent of cooperation or non-cooperation with the occupying invaders, the assassinations, murder of hostages, violence against the Jews, and the propaganda everywhere have split and sundered the human family.

Third, and most discouraging of all, there is no prospect that I can see of the victorious powers making even a half-way decent peace. Whatever the secret plans of Dumbarton Oaks and other conferences, the peace which they evolve will be neither just nor durable. It will be worse than Versailles; and unless there is a revulsion of popular sentiment that sweeps out present governments and substitutes new leaders who will set their faces against imperialism, economic nationalism, conscription, and race discrimination and who also will take genuine steps to end international anarchy by instituting world government based on the interest of all peoples, how can we expect that the peace will last as long as Versailles? Nor have I any expectation that there will be a saving revolution. I think that pacifists who count upon it are indulging in wishful thinking.

Summing up these tragic realities, we must then see that when hostilities cease, the IFOR will face the call to a ministry of reconciliation that is (a) world-wide, with an urgency such as never existed berore, that (b) the reconciliation must also bridge the cleavages within each nation wrought by damage to civilian populations, and that (c) our ministry must be carried on amid disillusionments of the peace that will be long and bitter. Our witness to pacifism after the war will still be foolishness to the world and a stumbling block to personal ambition.

But there is, thank God, more to the whole of reality than I have outlined in this dreadful picture. There are other facts in the universe that can fill us with joy and wonder. Once we see them and are captured by them, there can come to us a peace the world does not know.

We are ministers and stewards of the gospel of the resurrection. Throughout our stricken planet the war itself is producing hosts of *new* white corpuscles with whom we may collaborate in our global mission which is far beyond our own resources.

Professor Sorokin, who heads the Department of Sociology at Harvard University, and who has come to us out of Russia, maintains in his book, *Man and Society in Calamity,* that "Calamities are not an unmixed evil. Side by side with their destructive and pernicious functions they play also a constructive and positive role." They are "great educators of mankind. The principal steps in the progress of mankind toward a spiritual religion and a noble code of ethics have been taken primarily under the impact of great catastrophes."

Now from the viewpoint of Christian faith, this means, of course, that the Spirit of God does rise from the dead. God overrules the sins of man and immoral society to the extent that he uses them to stimulate and create in those who hear his voice and obey his call a resurrection of the spirit with power. It happens in this world and the next. Here truly even the Christian gospel itself comes out of the grave, where science had laid it for many. Although this insight is not the exclusive possession of pacifists, it is absolutely central to our vitality and work in this devastated world.

Enough has been said to suggest that a major task of the IFOR in the years immediately ahead should be to establish effective connections between pacifist individuals and pacifist groups in all countries. Making full use of the new possibilities for speed in intercommunication that are coming in the post-war world, it is incumbent upon us to discover and link in bonds of fellowship the scattered individuals and like-minded groups who are sore pressed in maintaining our faith.

Besides making connections of fellowship between persons, we have the duty of connecting the pacifist individual with the movement's rich store of ideas, with the stream of its life in history and the contemporary world. Man does not live by bread alone. Therefore we must compile the testament of pacifism, old and new, get the record from all countries, translate it into different languages, and see that it crosses frontiers.

In spite of various difficulties in the transfer of funds to Europe, we managed to send over $2,000 for war victims relief last October and we have maintained our regular IFOR monthly payments to Siegmund-Schultze.

In closing this report I gratefully mention the invaluable contribution which the International FOR Committee that meets in New York, under the chairmanship of Roswell Barnes, continuously makes to our planning. Last January the Committee drafted a memorandum to guide us in post-war policy. It was sent to a similar committee in London and has now been adopted by both committees provisionally. Some of its recommendations follow:

> "The guiding principle for our program should be reconciliation at three points: (1) across national frontiers; (2) across political, confessional, and ideological divisions within the nations; and (3) across racial cleavages. The resources of the IFOR in terms of personnel and finance should be made available in the first instance for such a program. Relief work and practical reconstruction enterprises should be subordinated to and contributory to the program of reconciliation.
>
> "The secretaries and representatives of IFOR should plan to visit centers in the various countries where members can be gathered together for conference, and planning (at the earliest possible date) of an International FOR Conference."
>
> "It is quite likely that members in Europe may often find it impossible to attend conferences either national or international without travel assistance; therefore, a considerable fund should be secured for such purposes and for travel in the Far East, in addition to the travel budget for the secretariat. The first claim on *relief* funds should be for the use of national secretaries and leaders in *Germany and liberated countries* for work among their own groups.
>
> "Because of the inevitable political involvements of government programs, it is doubtful whether IFOR personnel should become formally associated with such programs. It will probably be more appropriate to offer our services to the programs of the churches and of the Friends Service Committee in cases where satisfactory cooperative arrangements can be entered into.
>
> "In order to promote effectively a program of reconciliation, a rather extensive exchange of visitors should be planned between the nationals of wartime belligerent nations at the earliest opportunity. This might be planned to follow immediately after the first IFOR conference in Europe, and probably preceding an IFOR conference in Asia."

At its meeting in September the Committee expressed the opinion that I should be the first representative of the Fellowship in the United States to go to Europe to take counsel with our brethren about these plans. I am preparing to go at the earliest opportunity.

—JOHN NEVIN SAYRE.

* Excerpts from his report to the FOR Annual Fall Conferences, Sept.-Oct. 1944.

News from the Peace Front

Committee Suggests Changes in FOR Structure and Function

The National Council has appointed a committee consisting of Claud Nelson (chairman), Sheldon Rahn, Charlotte Bentley, Corinne Bowers, DeWitte Wyckoff, and the ex-chairman ex officio, to study a number of matters relating to the structure and functioning of the Fellowship. The committee began its work with a study of the process of nomination and election for the National Council. A preliminary report of the committe recommends the following:

(1) That membership of Council be reduced, perhaps to 60.

(2) That one-half be elected as at present, (i.e., nomination at General Conferences and by ballot of the entire membership) to serve a two-year term, so that one-half of this total would be chosen each year.

(3) That one-half be elected regionally by regional conferences or by the Regional Committees as each region in consultation with the NEC may determine, with length of service, etc., same as under preceding paragraph.

(4) That an annual meeting of the Council be held in September or at some other stated time so that members can plan to avoid conflicting engagements, and that provision be made in the national budget to pay the travel expenses of members who cannot otherwise attend, with the object of securing a full attendance of the Council at this meeting, and in any case some representation from each region and directly designated by that region. The details of the use of this appropriation should be worked out by the National Secretaries in consultation with regional committees with the object of securing the most representative maximum attendance. This meeting should be held at a central location to reduce travel costs and otherwise facilitate attendance. It should be made clear that those accepting nomination for the Council are expected to attend at least one of the three regular Council meetings during a given year, if possible the annual meeting. In addition to the appropriation to secure attendance at the annual meeting, a smaller travel appropriation should be made available to secure regional representation at each Council meeting. This might be done on the basis of membership; e. g., if these other Council meetings are customarily held in the Northeast, and membership in the Midwest, South, Rocky Mountain, Northwest, Northern California and Southwest is in the proportion of 4, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, attendance might be rotated so as to have at least two regional representatives at each meeting with the Midwest being represented twice as often as the South, etc.

At present the Executive Committee and Council have authority to coopt members up to five. This prerogative is usually exercised either to secure competent persons in or near New York City who can attend Executive Council meetings twice a month or to secure representation of some section of the country or some interest not represented otherwise. Should this practice be retained, modified, or discontinued?

The Baptist, Disciples, Episcopal, Lutheran, and Unitarian denominational pacifist fellowships elect two representatives each to the Council. Presumably this practice should be retained.

At present the five largest city groups elect one member each to the National Council. If the plan outlined above for election by regions is adopted, should this plan be continued or modified?

Provision should presumably be made for some high school age (Forerunners) representative on the Council.

It has been suggested that a variant plan to that outlined in the first four paragraphs above might be to have a National Board of about 30 members which would discharge the functions of the present National Council, whose members would be expected to attend meetings regularly and which would elect an Executive Committee as the National Council does now; and that this Board should also elect a National Council whose members would not have voting rights but who would receive minutes of the Executive Committee as the National Council does now; and that this Board should also elect a National Council whose members would not have voting rights but who would receive minutes of the Executive Committee and the Board, would be consulted from time to time, asked to carry out missions for the FOR in their localities, etc., as is done now by a considerable number of National Council members who can seldom attend meetings.

The members of the Fellowship are urged to send in any comments they may have on this report to A. J. Muste at the National Office.

Council and Staff Vote on NSBRO

In response to the request of a number of our members, the National Council at its September meeting arranged to have the names of Council members, together with their vote on the question whether FOR should remain in NSBRO or withdraw, published in FELLOWSHIP. At the close of the official ballot in July the vote stood 30 to 24 for remaining in. Since then a number of additional members have cast their votes so that the informal poll at the date of writing stands as follows:

For remaining in:—Roswell Barnes, Russell Bowie, Bernard Clausen, Phillips Elliott, Eugene Exman, Harold Fey, Sue Flanagan, John Haynes Holmes, Mrs. Margaret Lawrence, W. Appleton Lawrence, Harold Lunger, N. C. McPherson, Bruce Maguire, Merlin Miller, Tom Polk Miller, Vernon Nash, Claud Nelson, George Paine, Mrs. Henry Hill Pierce, E. McNeill Poteat, E. A. Schaal, Walter Sikes, Donovan Smucker, Jesse Stitt, Arthur Swift, John Thomas, Theodore Walser, Ronald Wells, Dan West, Norman Whitney, Wm. Ayer McKinney, Dan Wilson, Donald Harrington, Kirby Page, Trevor Sandness, Rufus Bowman.

For withdrawal:—Allen Barr, Charlotte Bentley, Corinne Bowers, James Bristol,* Allan K. Chalmers, Gladys Chang, Abraham Cronbach, J. Passmore Elkinton, Richard Gregg, Francis Hall, Gordon Hirabayashi, Jessie W. Hughan, Homer Jack, Charles Jones, Albert Livezey, Sheldon Rahn, Catharine Raymond,* Annette Richards, J. Holmes Smith, Howard Spragg, Hattie Stowe, Ralph Templin, Evan Thomas, DeWitte Wyckoff, James Alter, Sam Hohri, Laurence Hosie, Wm. W. Meyer, John Dillingham, Owen Geer, Carl Landes, Roy McCorkel, Douglas Steere.

No reply received to date:—John Adams, Margaret Campbell, James Crain, William Faulkner, Erna Harris, Charles Houk, Allan Hunter, E. Stanley Jones, Howard Kester, Gordon Lahrson, Ray Magnuson, Paul Roberts, Olcutt Sanders, Howard Thurman.

Not voting:—Charles Boss, Mrs. John Moors.

At the moment, therefore, the vote (informal) is 36 to 33 for remaining in.

At the time the Council was polled on the subject during the summer, the members of the staff were also requested to indicate their position on the subject, though none of them hold a voting membership in the National Council. The informal poll of staff members at this date is as follows:

For remaining in:—Nevin Sayre, Mary Farquharson, Elliott Finlay, Irene Ford.

For withdrawal:—A. J. Muste, Roger Axford, James Farmer, Caleb Foote, Marion Frenyear, Alfred Hassler, George Houser, Ernest Lefever, Margaret Ann Osborn, Margaret Rohrer, Louise Rounds, Bayard Rustin, Emily Parker Simon, Glenn Smiley, John Swomley.

Not voting:—Robert Gemmer, Emerson Schwenk. Constance Rumbough writes: "In putting myself on record as favoring the withdrawal of the FOR from the NSBRO I am expressing my personal conviction as an 'absolutist' rather than the sentiment of the Southern FOR as I am able to observe it. As a Staff member I did not vote on the motion. If I had, it would have been to stay in. This dual position was my stand also at the December Council meeting."

The memos for and against withdrawal which were sent to the members of the National Council are available in mimeographed form to any members requesting same.

* Representing city organizations at May Council meeting.

Campaign Against Permanent Conscription

The organizations and individuals who have for some time been meeting every month under the designation of Peace Strategy Board in order to secure the most effective coordination of pacifist activities, have recently taken an important step to strengthen the campaign against the threat of universal compulsory peacetime military training. They are setting up in Washington the Committee Against Permanent Conscription. Its headquarters will probably be the National Council for Prevention of War, 1013—18th Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. For the present, communications may best be sent to Frederick J. Libby at this address. Frederick Libby and E. Raymond Wilson, together with Abraham Kaufman and A. J. Muste, are now working out details.

For the present the work of the committee will be carried on through staff members of such organizations as the Fellowship, the War Resisters League, and the National Council for Prevention of War, who will be assigned to concentrate on this campaign and will spend a substantial amount of time in Washington.

At the same time that this committee will coordinate and extend the work of pacifists and pacifist organizations, efforts are being made to bring non-pacifist organizations into activity. Present indications are that no powerful non-pacifist organizations are likely to take an all-out stand against permanent conscription. However, a considerable number of churches and educational groups such as the National Education Association and the National Parent-Teachers Association, have come out strongly against the proposal to adopt this measure while the war is still on. Very recently *Labor,* the organ of the Railroad Labor Unions, has come out editorially against the adoption of permanent conscription during wartime, which represents the first substantial labor group to take such a stand. And during the past month the Illinois State Federation of Labor (AFL) came out with a strong statement flatly declaring that "there is no need for military conscription in America during peace times."

Individual members and local FOR groups can exercise a powerful influence in their own communities by informing the public of the evils involved in permanent conscription and by stimulating discussion on this issue at every opportunity. Whenever possible they should try to get leading citizens to form a Committee Against Peacetime Conscription and undertake the distribution of various printed materials available. (See ad on next page.)

For high school age youth, who are directly concerned with the problem, the best material to use is found in reprints of the September issue of *The Forerunner,* which was devoted almost entirely to discussions of the various phases of the conscription issue. Write for special rates on large quantities.

By tactful persistence individuals who are members can get churches, clubs, farm, labor, or other community groups to adopt resolutions, make public statements, or write Congressmen about their views on conscription. They can also talk personally with Congressmen who are at home and with those just elected. Writing letters to the editors of local newspapers is always effective; get as many people as possible to write.

Mark November 16-17 On Your Calendar

On those days in Washington, D. C., pacifists will hold a Conference Against Permanent Conscription. Word comes that Congress may move immediately after the election to put such a measure through. It is necessary, therefore, to rally our forces without delay. This will not be a public demonstration, but an executive session to study the problem and plan action. As many as possible, and especially FOR group leaders, CPS men, etc., should plan to come. Write for details to Frederick J. Libby, 1013 18th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Thomas Resigns

In a letter dated September 14, Evan Thomas resigned from the FOR. He states that a prime duty of pacifist organizations during war is conscientious objection; that the willingness to cooperate in the punitive measures imposed upon COs has made NSBRO an active agency in nullifying the testimony of pacifists; and that the continuance of support of NSBRO is a serious compromise. Dr. Thomas therefore declares that he must resign from any organization supporting NSBRO, but in severing official connections with the FOR he strongly affirms his wish to cooperate in the future in all efforts deemed in the best interests of COs and that his action is in no way directed against individuals in the FOR, but solely against the policies which support the demands of the NSBRO.

CO Hunger Strikes

Seven COs at Lewisburg Penitentiary started a hunger strike September 25. In sympathy a group of six COs at Danbury went on hunger strike for four days, and we are informed that there are at least two more hunger strikers in other prisons.

The strike at Lewisburg was precipitated when the Bureau of Prisons suddenly refused to permit a CO to leave prison on "good time" (the conditional release, prior to expiration of sentence, granted prisoners as part of established procedure) because he had participated in work strikes protesting racial discrimination and parole policies. It was stated that no man with a record of non-cooperation could expect release on good time. This man's release was subsequently permitted. The remaining six COs are continuing their fast since they feel that this specific concession does not indicate a change in official policy.

The real issues at stake, however, go deeper than the granting of good time. These COs have been protesting discrimination against them and among them. There often seems no discoverable rhyme or reason to the policies governing paroles to COs. Why some men are granted paroles and others are not is still an unfathomable mystery.

Evan Thomas recently wrote: "These and other serious charges demand the attention of every fair-minded American. The men have continued their fast for almost three weeks and expect to continue until the denial of good time for conscientious non-cooperation is revoked. Whatever individual pacifists may believe about the wisdom of such a course, it must be recognized that the hunger strike is the last resort COs in prison have for protesting injustices. We urge you to write Attorney General Francis Biddle, and James V. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, in Washington, requesting them to institute immediate reforms which will terminate this hunger strike. Do not delay."

Provide for Future

Devoted pacifists realize that whatever money is now being spent to promote the cause of peace is woefully insignificant in terms of conditions today and the probable requirements in the future. How to meet these needs is one of their great and persistent concerns. It has been suggested that members and friends who wish to help insure the continuance of the work of the Fellowship be urged to make a bequest for it in their wills. The following form may be used:

> I give and bequeath ——— dollars ($——) to The Fellowship of Reconciliation, an unincorporated association with headquarters at 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.

Since the testator can but rarely predict the needs which may arise in the future, it is recommended that no limitation be imposed upon the Fellowship with respect to the use of money which is given.

AFSC to Continue CPS

On October 4 the Board of Directors of the American Friends Service Committee accepted the recommendations of the CPS Executive Committee to continue AFSC administration of the Civilian Public Service program. The Board concluded that the CPS program does in the main give clear testimony to the pacifist faith of the Society of Friends, as well as a large body of men in the CPS camps.

Corrections

"Vindicae Flammae," the story by Gerald Heard in the October FELLOWSHIP, was reprinted from *Vedanta and the West,* which acknowledgement was inadvertently omitted from the footnote.

Franklin Kelley's address was given as CPS No. 52, Powellsville, Md., in last month's article; but he was transferred to the Government camp at Mancos, Colo., a few months ago.

The Peacemaker's Bookshelf

Lesson in History

Germany: A Short History. By George N. Shuster and Arnold Bergstraesser. W. W. Norton, Inc. 238 pages. $2.75.

This book ought to be required reading this fall in every college, every church's adult education department, for all officers in the Armed Forces, all members of Congress, all ministers and teachers, all literate pacifists and a few others! It is a practically perfect, and charmingly written, condensation of the history of Germany from medieval times to the invasion of Poland in 1939. Though Dr. Shuster, president of Hunter College, is a well-known Roman Catholic liberal the book seems to me admirably objective on such matters as Vatican policy and the role of the Catholic Center party in Germany. Thus, speaking of the session of the Reichstag in April 1937 where all power was finally turned over to Hitler: "It was Otto Wels, speaking for the social democrats, who manifested all the heroism that sorry day produces." As for Monsignor Kaas, head of the Center party, by declaring in favor of the Enabling Act, he "reduced to impotence a great German Catholic organization which since 1840 had stood proudly for freedom, truth, and justice."

The book deals with cultural and spiritual as well as political and economic developments. The fact that its authors support the war will make their comments all the more effective in combatting the tragic tendency toward revenge and the dismemberment of Germany which is growing so ominously.

Many situations are illumined in arresting fashion by the authors. One or two illustrations must suffice. For example, the vast majority of Germans thought of the first World War as a war against Russian czarism and barbarism. They were unable to understand Britain's entry into such a war on Russia's side. There was a terrific emotional reaction. "On August 4, 1914, the date on which Sir Edward Grey dispatched an ultimatum to Berlin, many Germans turned permanently from the west and its ideals."

The sinister figure of Ludendorff stands out, the militarist who granted safe conduct across Germany to Lenin and became one of the earliest and most vigorous supporters of Hitler!

Of post-war Germany: "The horrors of Verdun had convinced many young soldiers that war must immediately give way to a reign of love between men as desired by Christianity." Indeed even during the war pacifism was a strong force in Germany and Independent Socialists voted against war credits in the Reichstag.

Of the peace of Versailles: "It was precisely the decent democratically minded Germans who could not understand. Such Germans had themselves fought for many years for a just peace, and some of them had gone to prison for that reason. It seemed to them incredible that now, when they and not Ludendorff were in power, the attitude of the allied governments was the same as if nothing had occurred. . . . It gravely impaired their position inside Germany."

It has been said that the only thing men learn from history is that men learn nothing from history.

A. J. M.

Empire or Peace?

Empire. By Louis Fischer. Duell, Sloan, and Pearce. 106 pages. $1.00.

The peace will be no better than the men who make it. Governments create peace in their own image. The first job of the peace planners is to plan a world without empires. Otherwise it will be a world without peace. What right has England to rule India? None. The assumption of white racial supremacy makes Western imperialism the blood brother, or perhaps the father, of Fascism. Hitler is the child of our civilization. We made him—by being what we are. The shortest road to World War III is the assumption that the problems of peacemaking are complicated. The peace is not only being made every day; it is being lost every day. Either we take our war aims seriously or the Asiatic cannot take the war seriously.

The above paragraph is a string of practically verbatim quotations from Louis Fischer's book. They will suffice to assure *Fellowship* readers of the brilliance and significance of this brief study of "empire" in India and elsewhere. It seems to me that he meets conclusively, indeed with devastating finality, every one of the arguments against immediate independence for India.

A. J. M.

Realistic Pacifism

Politics: A Monthly Review edited by Dwight Macdonald.

Two articles by the editor himself in the September 1944 issue are of the utmost significance for pacifists and give me the opportunity to urge readers of *Fellowship* who are seriously interested in a left-wing analysis of international relations, economic developments, trends in revolutionary movements throughout the world, and related subjects to subscribe for this magazine. Subscription is $2.50 per year and the address 45 Astor Place, New York 3, New York. Much of the material it presents from month to month simply cannot be obtained elsewhere.

One of the articles above mentioned is the first in a series on *War As An Institution* and is entitled *On the Psychology of Killing.* It opens up in penetrating fashion a field to which pacifists have thus far paid too little attention. The other article *Here Lies Our Road* says: "The Realpolitiker always appears to be more realistic than the revolutionary since his goals are modest and hence more easily obtainable—also because, except at moments of revolutionary crisis, his behavior conforms more closely to what exists. But it is precisely such historical crises which the revolutionary thinks and lives for. When they come the caution of the Realpolitiker appears as the wildest romanticism, his little 'positive' proposals seem very negative indeed."

The July 1944 issue, by the way, contained an excellent article by FOR member Don Calhoun on *The Political Relevance of Conscientious Objection.*

A. J. M.

CONSCRIPTION
Threatens the Peace!

Arouse public opinion by buying and distributing as much as possible of this excellent, informative material. It is sold at cost, so help us to reduce expense by sending cash with order and eliminating all billing.

Can Peacetime Conscription Be Justified?

Reprint of Oswald Garrison Villard's article in October FELLOWSHIP.

25c a dozen—100 for $1.00

Peacetime Conscription

Brief but comprehensive answers to the most common questions.

35c a dozen—50 for $1.00

Should the U. S. Adopt Permanent Military Conscription?

Statements of 18 religious, educational, and civic groups.

15c a dozen—100 for $1.00

What's Wrong with Peacetime Universal Military Training For the United States?

A single-sheet flyer with five strong arguments.

50 for 25c—250 for $1.00

FOR Field Secretaries

South: Constance Rumbough, 1804 Grand Avenue, Nashville 4, Tenn.; *Midwest:* Emerson Schwenk, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Ill.; *Northwest:* Mary Farquharson, 4033 University Way, Seattle, Wash.; *Northern California:* Caleb Foote, 2151 Vine Street, Berkeley 7, Cal.; *Southwest:* Glenn Smiley, 1837 N. Berendo Street, Los Angeles 27, Cal.; *Rocky Mountain:* Margaret Rohrer, 1418 Grape Street, Denver, Colo.; *Rural:* Warren Nelson, Prairie du Sac, Wis.; *Action Projects:* George Houser, 7100 Kinsman Rd., Cleveland, Ohio.

Pro and Con

Letter from Prison

To Supporters of CPS:

Most outside pacifist groups actively or passively supported the recent farce staged by Selective Service. They ignored the stand of 80 or 90 per cent of the prisoners for complete pardon or genuine parole, supported conscriptive paroles, sanctioned the control of these paroles by Selective Service. No doubt it seemed necessary to help "as many as possible," seemed politically expedient, etc. But the actual effects have been all too clear: Selective Service and the Bureau of Prisons have, by wise staging and publicity, not only escaped liberal pressure in Washington, but also made clear to public and liberals alike that the great bulk of prisoners are in only because they want to be in, are negativists, fanatics, would-be martyrs. Finally, to illustrate the good faith in which the entire affair was staged, those who want their parole are trickling out at the same pace as before.

Why, in all the busy world of liberal agitation, among all those sincerely concerned, politically scheming and pressuring, was there so little realism, so little harsh integrity as to bring all this to pass?

JOHN MARSHALL,
Sandstone Prison.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: *John Marshall's letter is one instance among many of the cleavage that tends to develop between various groups of pacifists. There are genuine and serious difficulties that should not be minimized; but some are unnecessary because they are based on misunderstanding and ignorance of the facts. It is true that most pacifist organizations welcomed the announcement of the 8641 parole plan because, on the face of it, it seemed to open the way for parole for a good many men in prison. But the leaders of FOR and WRL, for instance, did not suspend their watchful and critical attitude, never "supported conscriptive parole" or ignored COs who could not accept the new plan, soon denounced the undesirable features of it, and increased efforts for genuine parole. For example, FOR within the past three months increased from $50 to $200 per month its contribution to NCCO, the chief agency working on parole problems.*]

Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

Franklin Kelley's article in the October issue of FELLOWSHIP, criticizing participation in CPS by religious agencies, is good as a shock treatment. I heartily disagree with the approach of the writer, however.

The author chooses to regard participation in morning meditation and worship services in CPS camps as trying vainly to "learn to swim in six inches of water." Such a revealing remark in regard to the infinite ocean of God, to which meditation and worship services may bring seekers who are willing to search for themselves, indicates that the writer is unable to practice devotional discipline on his own initiative. Significant worship is the source of all significant actions and movements in the world, including that led by Mr. Gandhi.

"It is better to light a candle than curse the darkness," is a familiar saying. No religious agency attempts to force light on us in CPS, nor can it supply us with Gandhis to inspire us. Yet many of us refuse to accept and use for ourselves the light of religious self-discipline.

Much of the criticism of religious agencies by a strong and very vocal minority in CPS, of which Mr. Kelley is a representative, arises from the immaturity and limitations of men, who, in the frustration of being conscripted, are unequal to the opportunity for self-discipline which the religious agencies provide.

It is apparent that we men who appear to have outgrown the immaturity of participation in war, are still very immature in other respects. A change in administration of CPS will not absolve us from our immaturity. Only we can do that, and then only by self-discipline in the ocean of significant worship, for which discipline there is ample opportunity under the administration by religious agencies.

FRANCIS D. HOLE.

A PAGE OF COMMENT BY READERS

Readers are invited to contribute to this page. Please keep letters brief, since space is severely limited.

The Editors,
FELLOWSHIP:

I joined the FOR under the impression that I would be supporting an organization designed chiefly for the purpose of furthering peace and the practice of passive resistance among men and nations. The avowed aim of the FOR is not, as I understand it, to introduce social reforms, but rather to persuade individuals and nations to adopt a long-suffering love toward one another, and to persuade them, not through political action, but only propaganda addressed to them as spiritual beings. Thus, I was annoyed to find among some announcements sent me by the local FOR, a questionnaire and other material issued by an organization calling itself "Religion and Labor Foundation," said material being an attempt to enlist the addressee in their program to further the interests of labor, especially through the church, and apparently by bringing pressure to bear on the various divisions of government.

This attempt, in my opinion, is foolhardy, since it tends, like the recent puerile skating rink incident outlined in FELLOWSHIP, to emphasize class differences rather than minimize them. Furthermore, the Foundation's assumption that everyone favors a solution of economic problems on a basis of what they glibly call "economic justice" is extremely ill-founded. I am interested in fellowship, but not in reform, since all reform as we know it, except that which a man imposed on himself, is inevitably linked with coercion. And if the FOR intends to become an agency for such political and social quackery, I would rather retire, regretfully, from membership in it.

BOYD HANNA.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912 AND MARCH 3, 1933. Of *Fellowship* published monthly, at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1944.

STATE OF NEW YORK }
COUNTY OF NEW YORK } ss:

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared J. Elliott Finlay, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the managing editor of the *Fellowship* magazine, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Fellowship of Reconciliation, 2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Editors, John Nevin Sayre and A. J. Muste, 2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Managing Editor, J. Elliott Finlay, 2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; Business Manager, None.

2. That the owner is: Fellowship of Reconciliation, 2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y. Phillips P. Elliott, Chairman, 124 Henry Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.; A. J. Muste, and John Nevin Sayre, Secretaries, 2929 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; and J. Passmore Elkinton, Treasurer, Moylan, Pennsylvania.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

J. ELLIOTT FINLAY
Managing Editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 29th day of September, 1944.

BURT H. FALL
My commission expires March 30, 1945.

(Seal)

SEND YOUR FRIENDS F. O. R.

Christmas Cards

THIS YEAR AND HELP THE War Victims Fund

Something new and different this year—a message for Christmas written by Henri Roser, former secretary of the International F.O.R., in Nazi-occupied Paris on Christmas, 1942. The card is beautifully printed in two colors, and may be sent either as a post card or in envelopes, as you wish.

WITHOUT ENVELOPES	WITH ENVELOPES
to send as post cards	Space for note on back
50c dozen — $4.00 per 100	**65c dozen — $5.00 per 100**

Send a self-addressed, stamped envelope for sample

YOU CAN'T AFFORD TO MISS THESE

***America's Role in Asia*, Harry Paxton Howard**
The amazing record of the activities of Western powers in the Far East and their responsibility for present developments there. $3.00

***Germany: A Short History*, Shuster & Bergstraesser**
A skillful portrait of the development of the German mind from medieval times to the outbreak of the war. Required reading! ... $2.75

***Peace Through Cooperation*, J. Henry Carpenter**
An explanation of the relationship between cooperation and cooperatives as the basis of peace. Paper edition only 50 cents. Cloth, $1.25

***Tailor's Progress*, Benjamin Stolberg**
Fascinating story of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union in a setting of the entire labor movement and American democracy $2.75

Seed of Chaos

By VERA BRITTAIN

First time in America —the book from which

"MASSACRE BY BOMBING" was condensed.

75c

118 Pages. Paper.

Outcasts!

Caleb Foote's dramatic illustrated story of the Japanese relocation. .... *Now Only* 10c

The Gist

A pocket digest of many books, articles and speeches on peace. INVALUABLE 25c

---

A Subscription to FELLOWSHIP — the gift that keeps on giving!

Give a year's subscription to FELLOWSHIP to friends who are sympathetic toward pacifism but want to know more about it before joining our ranks. They will appreciate it and you will be helping the cause. We send gift announcement cards.

SPECIAL $1.00 A YEAR

BOOKS

ARE PERFECT GIFTS

Here are a few that we highly recommend

With the Master
By Philippe Vernier. Nearly 80 brief meditations on Scripture passages. Beautiful and inspiring ..... **$.75**

In This Our Day
By Edith Lovejoy Pierce. Her first volume, expresses the mood of those who seek truth in a troubled world .. **$1.50**

Say Yes to the Light
By Allan A. Hunter. A challenge to Christians to take Jesus' teachings seriously. The consequences of our choice **$1.50**

A Preface to Prayer
By Gerald Heard. An important, helpful discussion of the reasons for and the technique of praying. His latest **$2.00**

Peace Is the Victory
Edited by Harrop Freeman, this is essential reading for pacifists. Chapters by 13 prominent Christian pacifists, **$1.50**

Out of Darkness
By John Haynes Holmes. A realistic facing of the world situation by "a long-range optimist" **$1.50**

The Fall of Christianity
By G. J. Heering. A scholarly discussion of the attitudes of the church toward the state and war..... **$1.50**

White Corpuscles in Europe
By Allan A. Hunter. Dramatic stories of the efforts of five men and women of good will in Europe ..... **$.75**

CASH WITH ORDERS

You will get better service and help us reduce the expense of bookkeeping if you will be kind enough to send cash with all orders. Overpayments promptly returned.

THANK YOU!

Fellowship Publications

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION, 2929 Broadway, New York 25, N. Y.